



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,097	06/22/2006	Emmanuel Ardichvili	STW-FR030160US1	1408
25235	7590	09/03/2009	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500 1200 SEVENTEENTH ST DENVER, CO 80202				DOAN, KIET M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentcolorado@hhlaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/584,097	ARDICHVILI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	KIET DOAN	2617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/NICK CORSARO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Kiet Doan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

DETAILED ACTION
Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08/19/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument in claim 1 and 10 that the combination of prior art does not rejected.

- a) producing a control pulse after having received a certain number of chips of the received signal.
- b) sending, to demodulation units in the receiver, a delayed signal in which chips have been omitted or duplicated on the basis of said control pulse.
- c) demodulation units; wherein the timer is arranged to produce a control pulse after having received a certain number of chips of a received signal.

The examiner respectfully disagrees for the reason.

a) Bolan clearly teach the portable/remote module received such a carrier, it replies with data transmission frequency/RF wherein segregated on the receiver chip. The receiver chip (after) received RF signal than out put a burst of pulse, That is, which read on producing a control pulse after having received a certain number of chips of the received signal (See col.4, lines 37-38, 46-56, Col.12, lines 20-34).

b) Ishigaki put forth to cure the limitation of "sending, to demodulation units in the receiver, a delayed signal in which chips have been omitted or duplicated on the basis of said control pulse" (Col. 5, lines 15-17 and 38-50, Col.11, lines 60-64 teach the demodulation unit that when receiving the spread spectrum signal and separating the spread spectrum signal into multiple spread spectrum signal wherein send to delay circuit for detecting and giving slot time delay).

c) Further, Ishigaki teaches the demodulation unit output signal to derive forming a control signal for reproducing a clock signal and reset signal on the basic of the control signal in order to equivalents information signal (see Col.6, lines 42-60). That is, which read on "demodulation units; wherein the timer is arranged to produce a control pulse after having received a certain number of chips of a received signal". Therefore, the examiner maintain the combination of prior art that rejection the claims limitation..